

REMARKS

The Official Action has been carefully considered, and the Examiner's comments are duly noted. Reconsideration of this Application in the light of the following comments is respectfully solicited.

Applicant as noted elects to prosecute the Group I claims directed to the embodiment illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2, while respectfully asking for reconsideration on the basis of the following arguments.

It should be noted that this Application is based on a PCT Application. For the sake of the record, Applicant proposes to submit another claim for the Examiner's Consideration to satisfy PCT Rule 13.1 to provide a single inventive concept while, at the same time, it is Applicant's position that this Application contains a claim, specifically claim 30, which is directed to a single inventive concept and all of the claims are appropriately linked. It is also proposed that claim 30 be retained in the present Application to provide a basis for all of the other dependent claims.

It should be noted that all of the claims in this Application are either directly or indirectly appendant to claim 30. Therefore, claim 30 is a claim which provides for a single inventive concept. Also, unless the Examiner has prior art which renders this claim unpatentable, PCT Rule 13.1 is satisfied.

To justify the position taken by the inventor/Applicant of this Application, reference is initially made to the first and second embodiments as shown in Figs. 1-2, and Figs. 3-4.

Regarding Figs. 1 and 2, and Figs. 3 and 4, the concept of the second embodiment in Figs. 3 and 4 is covered in the description of Figs. 1 and 2. Note lines 25 to 30 on page 11 which calls for a shallow trough 5 and the statement is made regarding overflow of water. Therefore, while these are two separate embodiments, there is a common feature of novelty which is all that is required for a PCT Application. In this respect, since this U.S. Application is based on a PCT Application, the PCT rules apply and the subject matter directed to Figs. 1 to 4 have the required common feature of novelty.

In addition, it should also be noted that the PCT Examining Authority did not raise any unity objection.

For the sake of the record, Applicant desires to bring the following to the attention to the Examiner:

The PCT as advised by the Applicant did not raise unity of invention in the IPER. It should be noted from the IPER, that the invention as claimed in the present application is a mould for injection moulding which includes an arrangement to assist in controlling of the mould temperature including at least one chamber that is partially filled with liquid and partially filled with liquid vapour positioned such that heat is transferred from a target mould location to the liquid in the chamber. A condensing means is also located in the chamber to effect condensation of the liquid vapour and characterised in that the liquid in the chamber is arranged to be held at different heights in the chamber.

Turning now to the objection raised with respect to the third embodiment, regarding the "flock," it is respectfully requested that this be held in abeyance until a decision is reached on claim 30, or another proposed claim which is also considered to be generic and satisfies PCT Rule 13.1

The Examiner has indicated in the last paragraph of page 2 that upon allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration to claims to additional species.

Applicant as noted elects to prosecute the species of Figs. 1 and 2. For this purpose, claims 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 39, 52, and 54 to 56 are directed to this embodiment. With respect to claim 35, this claim is depended on both claims 30 and 31, and should be considered for purposes of this response as dependent on claim 30. Of course, if necessary, its dependency on claim 31 can be amended.

Claim 35 can be considered to be a linking claim, and if this claim in combination with claim 30 is found to be patentable, then the first and second embodiments are linked with this claim. Therefore, the subject matter of claims 30, 31, 38, 41, 44 and 45, as well as 35, would satisfy the requirements of rule 13.1.

With respect to the third embodiment, the non-illustrated embodiment and directed to claims 30, 31 and 46 through 51, and if any one of claims 46 to 51 are considered to be allowable, then the subject matter of claims 30, 31, 35 and one of the flock claims would be allowable. For this purpose, the following claim is submitted for the Examiner's consideration as a linking claim to establish a common feature of novelty or a single general inventive concept.

With respect to embodiments 4 and 5, at present claim 30 is submitted as generic to all four embodiments. Claim 31 covers three of the four embodiments.

MAR-08-2004 15:30

LACKENBACH SIEGEL LLP

P.08  
CUSTOMER NO. 28752

If additional fees are needed, please charge them to our Deposit Account 10-0100.

Respectfully submitted,

LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

*Howard Siegel*  
Howard Siegel  
Customer No. 28752  
Telephone No. 914-723-4300  
Fax No.: 914-723-4301